

STATINTL

urges the Voice of America to begin broadcasting programs in the Yiddish language to the Soviet Union, in order to recognize the cultural heritage of the more than 3 million Soviet Jews and to display our Nation's support for the Soviet Jewish struggle for freedom.

Mr. President, for several years, first as a member of the House and more recently as a Senator, I have been calling upon the Soviet authorities to afford full religious and cultural rights to the Soviet Jewish community. I have urged that the Soviet Union not only assure these rights to Jews within the Soviet Union but also permit those Jews who wish to emigrate to do so.

I am pleased, therefore, to join in this resolution, which points to something quite practical and wholly within the control of our own Government--the instituting of Yiddish programming on the Voice of America as a morale booster for the courageous Soviet Jews who, at this moment, are struggling for their freedom. Many are awaiting trial or have already been convicted for acts related to their status as Jews in the Soviet Union. Others are waiting literally for several years for permission to emigrate to Israel and other nations where they could live a fuller Jewish life. I feel that our Voice of America should begin reaching these people in Yiddish as the very least that our Nation could do for these brave, unfortunate people at this period in their history.

Moreover, I understand that there is precedent for what we are asking the Voice of America to do, since the Voice of America already broadcasts in the native tongues of other communities within the Soviet Union. These include the Latvians--1.9 million persons, the Estonians--1.3 million, the Lithuanians--2.7 million, the Georgians--2.8 million, and the Armenians--2.9 million. The Jewish community in the Soviet Union, numbering over 3 million, should certainly then be entitled to similar recognition, especially when, as in the past, the Soviet authorities are singling out the Jewish community for persecution.

Mr. President, last month I visited Israel and because of my long interest in the Soviet Jewish issue, I made a point of meeting with some newly arrived immigrants from the Soviet Union. My meeting with these three courageous persons has only bolstered by willingness to try to help the Soviet Jews in their cause. Visiting them at their quarters at a Jerusalem center for new immigrants, I listened to their stories, and now I would like to share them with Senators.

Alexander Rabinovich, 33, formerly a dentist in Riga, Latvia, had just come to Israel with his parents, his wife and his two small children, in search of a life, he told me, where Jews could perpetuate their own culture. His children, he told me, had frequently been taunted by the schoolmates with the derogatory Russian term for Jew, "zhid."

Clara Nachimofsky, also of Riga, is the mother of two sons, one 25, and the other 15. She and her husband waited 9 years for permission to leave the Soviet Union. When the permission finally came

through, they were allowed to take out their younger son, but their older one was kept behind and is still there.

Rachel Rabinovich, 25, from Vilna--no relation to Alexander--is one of the young Jewish activists who staged a sit-in last March at the Supreme Soviet. She told me she was sure this was what caused the authorities to let her come to Israel, although the next group of demonstrators to try that approach were all placed under arrest.

Looking back on that meeting with these three, I particularly recall what Rachel told me about the indomitable spirit of Jewish youth in the Soviet

The Jewish youth in Russia now want to get out. The activities are not going to stop. They are not going to stop until they all come here, to Israel.

Mr. President, I strongly support our Nation's taking a firm stand on behalf of the Soviet Jewish struggle for freedom, and Yiddish programming by the Voice of America would be a significant step toward that objective.

INFORMATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, declining the request of the House of Representatives for papers leading up to the negotiation of the Jay Treaty, said:

The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success most often depends on secrecy; and even when brought to a conclusion a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic; for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations, or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers.

There is an old saying to the effect that knowledge is power. In truth knowledge forms the base of power. Power is simply the ability to effect change, and bringing about a desired change is usually based on correct knowledge of that which one desires to alter.

For thousands of years the secrets of nature were hidden to man and he lived in a world of technological poverty. Control of the external material world came into being when man began to acquire accurate knowledge of factors theretofore hidden, of secrets kept by nature. Man learned how to effectively interfere in the course of material events when science revealed to him the actual relationship existing between things.

Knowledge of actual relationships, as opposed to ignorance of these relationships, gives man the power to influence the course of events. This applies no less to the world of men and nations than it does to the strictly non-human world of things.

It is necessary to understand this when examining the question of govern-

mental classification of certain information. Outside the Government of the United States lies more than just the citizenry of our Nation. There lie foreign powers led by men whose hostile intent disregard for basic morality, and proclivity for violent action is well known. To increase their ability to interfere in our affairs is not in the best interest of our citizens. Therefore the Government limits the distribution of certain types of information through various classification procedures when it is determined that the possession of this information would enhance the ability of hostile nations to adversely influence our national interest.

Although the power to classify has been abused--and what power has not--the basic rationale behind limiting access to certain types of information is unassailable. Thus, it is disturbing to see that efforts are being made to utilize the furor engendered by the New York Times' publication of highly classified stolen documents to strike further blows at our system of safeguarding information--information of inestimable value to nations whose object is the destruction of the United States and other free world nations.

For example, there was legislation recently introduced in the House of Representatives which called upon the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense and the Department of State to furnish "full and complete information" not only on the exact future plans for the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in South Vietnam but also for a full analysis of South Vietnam's military capability. Information of this sort is, of course, the primary objective of enemy intelligence operations.

While the need to safeguard defense-related information is obvious--and accepted by most people, it is also necessary, as George Washington pointed out, to limit access to some of the information concerning our relations with foreign nations. If confidential communications between ourselves and our allies begin to appear regularly in our Nation's dailies we will not long have frank exchanges of information with our allies, nor, for that matter, will we for long have any allies.

The importance of maintaining working alliance systems at this point in time was brought home to me at a recent breakfast meeting with Secretary of Defense Laird. I asked the Secretary whether he would agree with the thrust of the late Congressman L. Mendel Rivers' great speech concerning the Soviet threat which he gave shortly before his untimely death--see Newsletter 70-14. Congressman Rivers, then chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, had stressed the fact that the U.S. was now second to the Soviet Union in overall military strength. Secretary Laird replied that this was probably true if we were to consider the United States by itself; but, when we also consider the strength of our allies, the free world is still in first place.

Regardless of the dubious merits of basing our own force posture relative to the Soviet Union on the totality of free world strength, it is apparent that our